



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE RESULTS

DATE: JANUARY 23, 2006

CITY HALL – STUDY SESSION ROOM
68700 AVENIDA LALO GUERRERO
CATHEDRAL CITY, CA 92234

STUDY SESSION: 3:00 P.M.
REGULAR AGENDA: 3:15 P.M.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

KENDRA CULBERTSON, CHAIRPERSON

ED GERLACH, VICE-CHAIRPERSON
ED SOUTHARD

JOHN HOLT
ALAN WATERS

STUDY SESSION

- Review of the Agenda
- Discussion on Procedure

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

All members were present except for Committee Member Holt.

CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENTS

During this part of the meeting the public is invited to address the Architectural Review Committee on any matter not on the Agenda. If you wish to speak on an Agenda Item, please wait to be recognized under that item. **EXCEPT FOR SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THE BROWN ACT PROHIBITS THE ARCHITECTECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE OR STAFF FROM RESPONDING OR TAKING ACTION ON ANY COMMENTS MADE BY THE PUBLIC UNLESS IT PERTAINS TO AN ITEM THAT APPEARS ON THE AGENDA.** All speakers should give their name and city of residence, and please limit your remarks to three minutes.

REVIEW ITEMS

- A. **Administrative Design Review No. 05-013** - A proposal to reconsider the construction of a block wall along the perimeter of the Desert Princess Resort fronting on Vista Chino and 30th Street.

Applicant: Desert Princes Homeowner's Association
Joanne Rose, Homeowner's Association Manager
Location: 67967 Vista Chino
Zoning: RR (Resort Residential)
Planner: Ken Davis/Rich Malacoff

The applicant had requested to modify their previous approval that includes stone pilasters. The applicant would like to eliminate the pilasters and use different color slumpstone instead of the columns that has a different color. The committee stated that the color of the cap and columns should be a few shades darker than the wall and could be approved by staff. The applicant also included a modified landscape plan, which was conceptually approved by staff and would return with a final plan on February 27, 2006. The changes to the wall were approved and the landscape plan was continued to February 27, 2006.

B. Conditional Use Permit No. 04-019 - A proposal to review Final Landscape Plans for a shopping center.

Applicant: Carter Ewing
Location: Southeast Corner of Vista Chino and Landau Boulevard
Zoning: PCC (Planned Community Commercial) District
Planner: Rich Malacoff

This plan returned to the ARC with modifications to incorporate the desertscape, which the applicant has done. The Committee discussed the project and recommended that half of the Model Pine Trees be replaced with Shoestring Acacia Trees. A motion was made by Committee Member Waters, seconded by Committee Member Southard, and passed unanimously.

C. Design Review No. 05-004 – A recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council for a 96-unit hotel.

Applicant: Tri-Millennium Properties
Location: A parcel located east of George Montgomery Trail, south of East Palm Canyon Drive, and north of Avenida Lalo Guerrero
Zoning: MXC (Mixed Use Commercial) District
Planner: Rich Malacoff

Rich Malacoff described the project and its architecture. The ARC and Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council who will make the final decision. Rich Malacoff reviewed the project's compliance with the Design Guidelines and Committee Member Holt's comments. Rich Malacoff commented on the following:

1. A major issue is the applicant's desire to remove retail from the ground floor. The applicant has requested to modify the Design Guidelines to have this change made for hotels in the MXC District. This issue is interrelated to many other issues in the Downtown that impact pedestrian circulation. The ARC and the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council on this.
2. There are 2 flows of pedestrian travel that connect the project to the IMAX and the fountain of life and they were identified on the Site Plans.
3. The Guidelines call for minimization of building setbacks, which the applicant has done on all sides, except for the East Palm Canyon Drive which is the vehicular entrance.
4. Parking is accessed from George Montgomery Trail and screened by landscaping.

The City Engineer can grant access from George Montgomery Trail which has already occurred; however, ingress/egress from East Palm Canyon was denied. The circulation is consistent with the Guidelines.

5. The Guidelines call for the Oasis Concept, which the applicant has complied with architecturally. However, the applicant does need a covered walkway which has not been provided. The applicant said that the internal walkway was partially covered and they would work on that for the next meeting.
6. The Guidelines call for recessed windows and this information has not been provided yet and the applicant will provide this for the next meeting.
7. The Drought Tolerant Landscaping will be made a Condition of Approval and the ARC will approve the Final Plan prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
8. The columns have a width of 18", which meets the standard width requirement.
9. The use of arches is required and the applicant has used them throughout the project and grouped the windows with arches vertically.
10. The Design Guidelines call for divided windows and the applicant has not provided this and the plans need to reflect this requirement.
11. The roof has a pitch of 5-12, which is within the required roof pitch.
12. The "S" tiles on the roof are one of the allowed tiles of roof tile used.
13. The eaves of the roofs need to extend over the buildings as required similar to the Mary Pickford and City Hall.
14. There are elevations near the towers, which are blank, and need modification to include more architectural relief. This can be accomplished through decorative tile or reveals.
15. The applicant needs to ensure that all meters and equipment are screened.
16. The Guidelines call for coping on walls and columns and spacing that averages 10 feet on center. The applicant has provided this.
17. The choice of colors will compliment those already used in the downtown and comply with the Oasis Concept.
18. The driveway leading to the pavers needs to be labeled as concrete or cement. Asphalt will be prohibited.
19. The applicant has not provided mid-block paseos but agreed to look into making the rear entry a paseo of some form.

Mr. Malacoff also presented Committee Member Holt's comments with staff's response:

1. 9.31.080 Curb cuts are not allowed along George Montgomery Trail or West Buddy Rogers Ave.

This Section of Code allows these "curb cuts" if allowed by the City Engineer. This was done by Jerry Jack over a year ago. They were

denied access to East Palm Canyon Drive.

2. 10.07.04 Sidewalks north of East Palm Canyon Drive should be 8 feet in width. All sidewalks are less than 8' in width and are often only 5' in width.

This can easily be handled through a Condition of Approval in the staff report.

3. 9.31.050 Prohibits residential uses on the first floor facing Palm Canyon or the Town Square – motel rooms create the same street impact as apartments or condominiums and are R occupancies per code. It should be noted that this really is not a “hotel” due to the level of service and amenities. The end of section 9.31.050 states that “Uses not specifically listed in this chapter as permitted or conditionally permitted are expressly prohibited”. The motor inn or motor hotel would fall within the prohibited category.

The City Council has directed the applicant to apply for an amendment to the Design Guidelines. The applicant has submitted this application.

4. The site does not provide the basic structure required for the Pickfair Core. Some of the deficiencies are:

- a. Only one retail space provided and it does not relate to either the Town Square or the IMAX development.

The City Council has directed the applicant to apply for an amendment to the Design Guidelines. The applicant has submitted this application.

- b. No retail is provided at street level at the Square.

The City Council has directed the applicant to apply for an amendment to the Design Guidelines. The applicant has submitted this application.

- c. Building does not create a “street wall”. It is just a standard Hampton Inn placed in a vacant lot.

This can be a recommendation to the PC and the City Council

- d. The Site does not create pedestrian-oriented streets. There is no ground-level retail shops relating to the public street or to sheltered paseos and plazas.

The City Council has directed the applicant to apply for an amendment to the Design Guidelines. The applicant has submitted this application.

- e. The project does not create “Discreet yet attractive accessible parking areas”. The main entrance and registration parking is quite prominent to East Palm Canyon Drive. The registration area does not create the mid-block paseo required by the Guidelines but instead creates an auto court blocking pedestrian travel between the Town Square and the IMAX. The narrow, tortuous pedestrian path is another barrier to pedestrian traffic.

Staff and the Hilton are concerned about the pedestrian mode of

travel from the structure to the hotel. This can be forwarded as a comment and/or changed prior to any Planning Commission or City Council Meetings.

- f. The plan does not create the pedestrian "Main Street" leading off the East Palm Canyon frontage. There is no space for storefront entertainment and related retail.

The City Council has directed the applicant to apply for an amendment to the Design Guidelines. The applicant has submitted this application.

- g. This is the best location for a mid block courtyard described in III.C and the opportunity has been dismissed by the plan.

If the ground level retail is not required, this is hard to do, however it can go forward as a recommendation

- h. No attempt has been made to develop shaded areas along the George Montgomery Trail frontage to encourage pedestrian activity.

This can be forwarded as a comment and/or changed prior to any Planning Commission or City Council Meetings.

- i. The plan abandons the bell tower to a sea of parking and underdeveloped landscaping. I had hoped the parking area on the east side of Buddy Rogers was temporary to be replaced with retail/restaurant usage. This plan seeks to make bell tower isolation permanent.

The City Council had already approved this parking lot which is temporary and a building will be put there.

- j. The plan eliminates the possibility of developing a meaningful plaza at the east end of the IMAX building, further reducing the likelihood the retail/restaurant space will become viable in the future. It also presents a set of rooms at grade on that side eliminating any building interaction with that activity node.

The City Council has directed the applicant to apply for an amendment to the Design Guidelines. The applicant has submitted this application.

- k. The registration drop-off is on the south side of the building. This creates a major gap in the downtown core. It should be moved to the north side – even with the grade difference.

Staff tried to get the orientation to change to the east but they decided against that recommendation. Your proposal would have major issues for ADA and leave a poor elevation to East Palm Canyon.

5. Building Architectural Issues:

- a. The building presents an interesting court on the north side of the building, but I would not want to swim there in the high season since the building configuration will block the sun in winter.

This can be forwarded as a comment and/or changed prior to any Planning Commission or City Council Meetings.

- b. The arched window on the east side is attractive, but I am not sure how it works with the room above the viewing area – spandrel glass at the floor?

This can be forwarded as a comment and/or changed prior to any Planning Commission or City Council Meetings.

6. Major deficiencies:

- a. The building presents fan coil units on all sides of the building. This basically provides a view of mechanical units on all sides.

There is a standard COA that prohibits this and requires screening.

- b. The first floor provides only one retail space and it is located away from the plaza. Retail/restaurants are required on the ground floor of the east, west, and south sides of the building.

The City Council has directed the applicant to apply for an amendment to the Design Guidelines. The applicant has submitted this application.

- c. No arcades are provided on the east, west or south side of the building.

This can be forwarded as a comment and/or changed prior to any Planning Commission or City Council Meetings.

- d. The facades are not organized into 30' maximum bay widths 8.01.03. The "plant-ons" do not meet the intent of the guidelines.

This can be forwarded as a comment and/or changed prior to any Planning Commission or City Council Meetings.

- e. Openings are not "punched" and inset as required. Windows should be recessed at least 6" on a commercial property 8.01.05

This can be forwarded as a comment and/or changed prior to any Planning Commission or City Council Meetings.

- f. The large windows do not comply with 8.02.
Framing members are not thick enough.
The sliding windows are prohibited.
The windows do not have the typical vertical proportions requested by the guidelines.
Note: City Hall achieves this by providing groups of what appear to be double hung windows.
The large windows are not multi-paneled.

This can be forwarded as a comment and/or changed prior to any Planning Commission or City Council Meetings.

- g. The overhangs are insufficient to the architectural style. The Mary Pickford Theater

uses no overhang – more of a Santa Barbara approach – and the Civic Center uses a much deeper overhang on the Lalo Guerrero frontage.

This can be forwarded as a comment and/or changed prior to any Planning Commission or City Council Meetings.

- h. This building does not have the massing to follow the style. The roof does not relate to the elevations – it is just a “hat” placed on the building. The configuration of the north and south signage towers are particularly disappointing

This can be forwarded as a comment and/or changed prior to any Planning Commission or City Council Meetings. Signage is approved later.

- i. Few of the details suggested to enliven a large wall have been incorporated into this building. There are some nice columns and dry stack stone, but the columns do nothing to create public pedestrian areas (only really usable by motel guests) and the stone serves a fortification function, not a detail function. There is no tile, no iron details, no balconies – nothing to distinguish this building from a perimeter motel.

Staff had already planned to require this.

- j. Signage: The south signage is over-scaled – more suited to freeway usage than a prominent building on an urban boulevard. It must be more sensitive to the character of the downtown – this is neither the IMAX nor the Mary Pickford Theater. The north signage serves little purpose to direct guests to the building. It should be scaled to the street, not the Perez Road area. The west sign shows it to be an afterthought – how do we put a freeway sign on the west side? The east side may be properly scaled, but channel lettering is inappropriate for this side of the town square.

Signage is reviewed later but this can be forwarded as a recommendation and signs can be required to have review from the ARC.

7. Rich Malacoff summarized Mr. Holt’s strategies for “saving the project”.

The ARC only has authority to recommend and then makes a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council. The applicant can accept the changes and modify the plans or request that the plans remain as submitted.

Chairperson Culbertson expressed interest in providing a covered walkway from the parking structure to the hotel. The applicant had said that the walkway from Avenida Lalo Guerrero up to the hotel was covered.

Committee Member Gerlach stated that he wants to see the Arcade connection or trellis for the walkways and that retail should stay on the ground floor.

Committee Member Waters liked the vertical element of the windows as pointed out by staff.

Committee Member Southard thought it was an attractive facility, however he was concerned about the parking in- front of the hotel and that it be limited to loading and unloading.

Chairperson Culbertson stated that she was concerned over the loading zone in the front of the facility and that it should be moved. The applicant agreed to look at other options and report back to the

Committee at the next meeting.

The Committee unanimously agreed to continue the project to the February 27, 2006 Meeting of the Architectural Review Committee.

DISCUSSION

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

To the next regular meeting of the Architectural Review Committee to be held February 8, 2006, at 3:00 PM., at the City Hall - Study Session Room, located at 68-700 Avenida Lalo Guerrero, Cathedral City, California 92234.

NOTE TO THE PUBLIC:



IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITY ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT RICH MALACOFF, ASSOCIATE PLANNER AT (760) 770-0339. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE CITY TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING. [28 CFR 35.104 ADA TITLE II]